



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

his child, nor a teacher using the birch or the ferule in the management of his school ;—not an executioner inflicting the penalty of the law upon a criminal legally convicted and sentenced ;—not a government suppressing mobs and insurrections with the sword of civil authority ;—not an individual defending his own life, or that of his family, at the risk or sacrifice of a midnight assassin ;—not one Christian or church contending in ecclesiastical strife with another. We may, by a figure of speech, call *some* of these war ; but war, in the literal and general acceptation of the term, is something different from them all. It is a conflict of governments by the sword, one nation using every possible instrument of violence and injury to kill the citizens, destroy the property, and blast the happiness of another nation. This is war, the only species of war with which peace societies are concerned ; and we trust the community will do us and themselves the justice to bear this obvious distinction in mind.

4. *Early Christians on War.* By ENOCH POND, D. D.

Dr. Pond, at the request of Mr. Ladd, gives in this letter the result of his inquiries concerning “the views and practice of the early Christians in respect to war.” The writer is too candid or too cautious to decide the point at issue ; and his letter, though a valuable contribution to the literature of peace, too nearly resembles the chapter in *Don Quixote* entitled, “a conclusion wherein nothing was concluded.” The evidence adduced seems, in our judgment, to preponderate rather strongly in favor of the position, that the early disciples abstained from war in all its forms as inconsistent with their views of the gospel ; but our author is careful not to strike the balance either way, and merely says, “I do not believe, on the one hand, that the primitive Christians were Quakers ; nor is it possible to believe, on the other, that they possessed the same reckless indifference in regard to war, which has prevailed among Christian nations in modern times.” This conclusion, like the decision of Sir Roger de Coverly in the notable dispute between Tom Touchy and Will Wimble, that “much might be said on both sides,” is very safe for the reputation of the judge as impartial ; but we confess we see not the use of searching through tomes after tomes for what every body would have inferred from the slightest acquaintance with the character of the early Christians.

We have never been disposed to rely on the Fathers as decisive witnesses concerning the moral character of war ; and we have expected from them only a general confirmation of what the gospel teaches on this subject ; but we should be slow to believe, that “their testimony is often self-contradictory,” or that “it would not

be difficult to prove from them both sides of the question concerning war." Dr. Pond has quoted some of these alleged self-contradictions; but not one of them do we regard as really denying the fact, that *the early disciples, down to the corruption of Christianity, held war to be inconsistent with their profession as followers of the Prince of peace.* This position is sufficiently proved even by the quotations made by Dr. Pond himself; and the *incidental* allusions to the subject adduced as *contradictions*, ought, in accordance with the established laws of interpretation, to be construed as consistent with it.

We have never seen such an investigation of this point as we deem desirable; and we hope that some able friend of peace will set himself to the task, and scrutinize the whole field through other optics than modern, semi-pagan prejudices in favor of the war-system as "an ordinance of God." We have much confidence in Dr. Pond's qualifications for such a service; and, if he will only do it to his *own* satisfaction, we shall be glad to give the result without abridgment on our pages, as we *wished* to do with the letter before us.

Some of the points proved or admitted in this document, are the following:

1. "We have no account, *during the first century*, of any Christian being engaged in war."
2. All the Fathers during the first and second centuries confessedly speak in a way that would condemn *all* war. "They hold the same language as the inspired writers in regard to returning evil for evil, loving our enemies, &c.;" but such language, understood in its plain, obvious import, would, as all admit, forbid every species of war.
3. The early Fathers speak of the ancient prophecies concerning the reign of peace under the gospel, as actually fulfilled in the Christians of that age. On this point Dr. Pond is decided.
4. Celsus, the first writer of a book against Christians, charges them, near the close of the second century, with refusing to engage in war under any circumstances; and Origen, in answering Celsus fifty years afterwards, did not deny the charge, but justified Christians on the ground, that their religion forbids war. These points our author readily concedes; and we confess we see not what more is needed to substantiate the position we have laid down above.
5. But Dr. Pond gives us some very strong quotations from Tertullian in the first part of the third century.

"In his Apology (chap. 37), speaking of the abuses and persecutions to which the Christians at that period were exposed, Tertullian asks, 'In all this conspiracy of evils against us, in the midst of these mortal provocations, what one evil have you observed to have been returned by Christians? Whereas, in a night's time, we could have made ourselves ample satisfaction, had we not thought it unlawful

to repay one injury with another. But God forbid that any of this divine sect should seek revenge, or refuse to suffer what is sent to refine them. But if we would not revenge ourselves in the dark, but choose rather, as professed enemies, to engage you in the open field, do you think we could want forces? We are but of yesterday, and by to-day are grown up, and overspread your empire. Your cities, your islands, your forts, towns, assemblies, and your very camps, wards, companies, palace, senate, forum, all swarm with Christians. Your temples, indeed, we leave to yourselves, and they are the only places you can name without Christians. *What war can we now be unprepared for, were it not agreeable to our religion to be killed, rather than to kill?* In this passage, the doctrine of non-resistance is very clearly stated; and yet, Tertullian speaks of Christians as being found in the Roman *forts* and *camps*. Possibly, however, they were not there in the capacity of soldiers.

"In his work on Idolatry (sect. 19), Tertullian says, 'How shall any one go to war, nay, how even in peace shall he do the work of a soldier, without a sword, which the Lord hath taken away? For although the soldiers came to John, and received a rule to be observed, and though the centurion became a believer, yet *Jesus Christ, in disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier afterwards; for custom never sanctions among us an unlawful act.*'

In his work, *de Corona* (sect. 11), Tertullian asks, '*Can it be lawful to take the sword, when the Lord has declared, that he who useth the sword shall perish with the sword? And shall a son of peace go into the battle, to whom it is not lawful so much as (litigare) to go to law?* And shall he who may not revenge his own injuries, send others into bonds, and a prison, and torments, and punishments?'

"During the reign of Severus, there was a civil war, at which time more than a third of the Roman armies were in a state of open rebellion against their sovereign. Tertullian declares repeatedly, that, in these revolted legions, *not one Christian soldier could be found.* (See his Discourse *ad Scapulam*, and his Apology, chap. 35.)"

These strong statements cannot, we think, be countervailed by the incidental allusions to the subject of war which Dr. Pond quotes as contradictions. We deem it impossible in this way to destroy the force of Tertullian's explicit and repeated testimonies against war.

6. Our author gives some examples of Christians suffering martyrdom for their belief in the unlawfulness of the military profession.

"It is also true, that individuals occasionally refused, at the peril of their lives, to be enrolled in the army, on the ground that they were Christians, and that it was not lawful for them to fight. Others, being converted while connected with the army, declined continuing in the profession of soldiers, and were put to death. In the *Acta Sincera* of Ruinart (p. 299), we have an interesting account of one Maximilian, an African youth, who had been produced by his own father before the magistrate, as a legal recruit, but who obstinately persisted in declaring that his conscience would not permit him to embrace the profession of a soldier. He was slain with the sword. In the same work (p. 302), we have an account of Marcellus, a cen-

turion, who, on the day of a public festival, threw away his belt, his arms and the ensigns of his office, exclaiming with a loud voice, that henceforth he would obey none but Jesus Christ; and that he renounced for ever the use of carnal weapons, and the service of an idolatrous master. He was tried, condemned, and beheaded."

The inference from such examples is not to be neutralized by the statement, that they "must be regarded as exceptions to what was the general course of things near the close of the *third century*;" for every one knows, that Christians must as a body have become deeply degenerate on this subject at a period so near the time of Constantine the Great, that fatal era of the union of church and state.

7. "A great many causes must have operated, in the earliest and purest days of the church, to render its members adverse to war. Their love to their enemies, their passive submission under injuries, their preference, as Tertullian expresses it, 'rather to be killed than to kill,' the idolatrous oaths administered often, if not always, to those who entered the army, the multiform idolatries, and other vices, practised there,—all these things must have rendered the camp an abhorred place to one of the early followers of the Prince of peace, and must have rendered the life of a soldier exceedingly odious. Nor did the odium which attached to this course of life soon pass away. We discover it in those canons of the ancient church, which prohibit the ordination, not only of soldiers, but of those who had at any time been soldiers. The first council of Toledo prohibits the ordination of such persons, even though they had never been concerned in the shedding of blood."

We have now given the pith of Dr. Pond's letter; and we submit it to our readers, if he has not, after all, made out, from the views and practice of the early Christians, a pretty strong case against war as unchristian.

PERIODICAL PRESS.

Newspapers on Peace. We observe, with much pleasure and hope, the disposition of our best religious papers to insert articles on peace. More than twenty have been for several months publishing more or less on the subject, some of them every week; and thus not less than one or two hundred thousand minds have been reached with appeals in behalf of this cause. We hope *every* religious paper in the country will do the same, and thus supersede the necessity of establishing distinct papers for this cause. The best even of our secular papers are willing to publish on peace; and we hope our friends through the land will promptly improve such facilities for promoting this cause, especially at such a time as the present.

Mr. Garrison's views of Peace. Most of our readers already know, that Mr. Garrison proposes hereafter to give the *Liberator* a wider range, and to discuss, among other things, the subject of peace. His

prospectus for the next volume discloses his views on this subject; and the community will now be able to discriminate between him and the American Peace Society.

"Next to the overthrow of slavery," he says, "the cause of *peace* will command our attention. The doctrine of non-resistance, as commonly received and practised by Friends, and certain members of other religious denominations, we conceive to be utterly indefensible in its application to national wars; not that it 'goes too far,' but that it does not go far enough. If a nation may not redress its wrongs by physical force,—if it may not repel or punish a foreign enemy who comes to plunder, enslave or murder its inhabitants,—then it may not resort to arms to quell an insurrection, or send to prison or suspend upon a gibbet any transgressors upon its soil. If the slaves of the south have not an undoubted right to resist their masters in the last resort, then no man, or body of men, may appeal to the law of violence in self-defence; for none have ever suffered, or can suffer, more than they. Now, the doctrine we shall endeavor to inculcate is, that the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; consequently, that they are all to be supplanted, whether they are called despotic, monarchical, or republican, and he only who is King of kings and Lord of lords, is to rule in righteousness. The kingdom of God is to be established IN ALL THE EARTH, and it shall never be destroyed, but it shall 'BREAK IN PIECES AND CONSUME ALL OTHERS.'

"As to the governments of this world, whatever their titles or forms, we shall endeavor to prove, that, in their essential elements, and as at present administered, they are all anti-Christ; that they can never, by human wisdom, be brought into conformity to the will of God; that they cannot be maintained, except by naval and military power; that all their penal enactments, being a dead letter without an army to carry them into effect, are virtually written in human blood; and that the followers of Jesus should instinctively shun their stations of honor, power and emolument, at the same time 'submitting to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake,' and offering no *physical* resistance to any of their mandates, however unjust or tyrannical.

"These are among the views we shall offer in connection with the heaven-originated cause of peace. * * * * * We regret, indeed, that the principles of abolitionists seem to be quite unsettled upon a question of such vast importance, and so vitally connected with the bloodless overthrow of slavery. It is time for all our friends to know where they stand. If those whose yokes they are endeavoring to break by the fire and hammer of God's word, would not, in their opinion, be justified in appealing to physical force, how can they justify others of a different complexion in doing the same thing? And if they conscientiously believe that the slaves would be guiltless in shedding the blood of their merciless oppressors, let them say so unequivocally; for there is no neutral ground in this matter, and the time is near at hand when they will be compelled to take sides."

This appeal to abolitionists we deem worthy of their special attention; but, while we regard Mr. Garrison as a devoted friend of

peace, we would remind our readers of the broad distinction which ought to be made between the views expressed above, and those for which alone our Society is responsible.—1. His immediate object is not so much peace as *political reform*. He contemplates not the intercourse of nations, but the internal operations of government; while we are restricted entirely to the former, and do not inquire, as any part of our appropriate object, how a government ought to treat its own subjects.—2. Mr. Garrison denies the right to inflict the punishment of death in any case, or to use the sword in suppressing mobs and insurrections. These points do not come within the province of our cause.—3. He would, also, exclude from government every kind and degree of physical force. We hold no such opinion; nor does the cause of peace require us to express our views on this point any more than upon a hundred other points of civil and criminal jurisprudence.—4. Mr. Garrison would even annihilate all human governments as punishments inflicted on mankind for their wickedness. His aim is not to reform, but to destroy them; while it is our business as peacemakers merely to dissuade them from settling their disputes by an appeal to arms.

We wish our aims and views to be distinctly understood. There are three kinds of offences,—of individuals against individuals; of individuals against society, or citizens against government; of one society, government, or nation against another. The cause of peace, as an affair between *NATIONS alone*, is confined exclusively to the third class; while Mr. Garrison sweeps over the three classes, and would make the cause of peace only another designation for the government of God over mankind in *all* their social relations.

ARTICLE VIII.

MISCELLANEOUS.

RESOLUTIONS ON PEACE.—The South Middlesex Association of Congregational ministers, at their meeting in Framingham, Mass., Nov. 7, 1837, passed the following resolutions on the subject of peace:

“Whereas, the ultimate prevalence of peace over the whole earth is rendered certain by the promises of the Bible, and whereas the gospel is appointed as the grand instrument under God of effecting this glorious result; therefore, resolved,

1. That, for this purpose, the gospel must be applied to the intercourse of nations in such a way as to insure the pacification of our world as fast as it shall be converted to God.

2. That the continuance of the war-system in Christendom itself for so